

back, maybe you ought to be prosecuting that.

Oh, and, by the way, how do we know she doesn't just limit it to kids with a joint? Well, what is No. 13 on the list? Possession with intent to distribute.

So, drug dealers—in Joe Biden's America, drug dealers, it is legal. You can sell booze to kids. You can sell drugs to kids. You can sell stolen televisions to kids. She doesn't prosecute drug dealers.

But look, at least it is just pot and come on, we know—you know, in States—in a lot of States pot is not that bad, right? It is just pot.

Uh-oh. No. 14, nonmarijuana drug possession. So for any Democrats ready to go home, saying, "Hey, we just like pot because we are Democrats," nope. Heroin, cocaine, LSD, fentanyl drug dealers who are poisoning our kids, in Joe Biden's America, we don't prosecute you.

And No. 15 is really the crowning jewel of this—resisting arrest. So I want you to envision what this says. You can break and enter into a vacant property and do damage. You can have a homeless person trespass on your front lawn, set up a tent, threaten your children, sell them drugs, and if a police officer shows up and tries to arrest them, they can violently resist arrest. And what does the DA say? "All good by me. Not a crime."

Madam President, this is, in a word, nuts. This is crazy.

And do you know what? This is what the Democrats support.

I will tell you why. The Democrats are counting on the news media refusing to cover this. The Democrats are counting on ABC, NBC, and CBS—this is not news. The Democrats are counting on CNN will not cover this.

Every single Democrat in this body has voted for Rachael Rollins. They had to bring Vice President HARRIS out to break the tie.

And, you know, Democrats, when they go home, they like to say: "We are not for abolishing the police."

No. Do you know what? When you vote to confirm a lawless so-called prosecutor who says "I won't prosecute crime," you have abolished the police. Cops can arrest them, but the DA will let them go. And what does she say? "Dismissed . . . prearrestment . . . without conditions."

This is radical and extreme, and I want to make a challenge to Senate Democrat colleagues. Some of you are in purple States. A few of you are in red States. Some of you are in bright blue States. I challenge any of you in the bluest State of the Union to go home to your constituents, get any gathering in a townhall, and put this chart in front of them. Ask your constituents: Do the people of Nevada agree that we shouldn't prosecute trespassing or shoplifting or drug dealing or resisting arrest or violent threats? Do the people of Virginia agree that these are not crimes and shouldn't be prosecuted?

And I promise you, in all 50 States, there is not a State too blue where your constituents would agree on this. And so what our Democratic colleagues are counting on is that people won't know.

You know, before the vote, I spoke with several Democrats. I tried to tell several Democrats, this is a bad vote. This is a vote you are going to regret. This is a vote your constituents are going to be mad at you for. One of those Democrats said: "Well, the majority leader asked me to do it."

You know, crack the whip, party unity, party discipline. The order from the Democrats in the White House is this is the chief Federal law enforcement officer in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. God help you if you don't want violent criminals robbing your store. God help you if you don't want drunken homeless people setting up tents in your front yard. God help you if you don't want drug dealers selling drugs to your children because Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS have said those are all A-OK. And if you don't believe me—because in this bizarre partisan world nobody believes the other side—read the memo, "The Rachael Rollins Policy Memo." She wrote it. She put her name on it in writing. This is what it says.

If we lived in a time of sanity—Senators on both sides—Democrats listening to this would say: "Hold on a second. That doesn't make any sense at all. Let's tap the brakes."

By the way, one Democrat could stop this nomination—one. Every individual Democrat, you had the choice. It means every one of you is also the deciding vote. So when you go back to your home State, you singlehandedly decided this lawless, so-called prosecutor should be confirmed.

I will tell you this, you can never again claim you oppose abolishing the police because this vote is front and center: trespassing, not prosecuted; shoplifting; larceny; disorderly conduct; receiving stolen property; driving with a suspended license; breaking and entering with property damage; loss and malicious destruction of property; threats; minors in possession of alcohol; marijuana possession; possession with intent to distribute; nonmarijuana drug possession.

I don't ever want to see a Democrat standing up here talking about fentanyl: Fentanyl is terrible. I don't want to see another Democrat talking about the opioid crisis, saying: "People are dying in New Hampshire. People are dying in my State." They are, and you are about to vote for a prosecutor who won't prosecute the drug dealers selling those opioids and poisoning our children and won't prosecute resisting arrest. So, if a cop comes, take a swing.

To my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle, there is still time for you to stop this nomination. I implore of you: Listen to your constituents and do the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote not begin until following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, in a minute, I am going to ask unanimous consent for the approval of three important nominees who are not controversial. We have been hearing reasons to oppose a nominee who has some controversy, and I am going to raise three who are not controversial.

In July, I had the opportunity to travel to Mexico, Ecuador, Colombia, and Guatemala as part of a bipartisan congressional delegation. The first question we received in Mexico was not about COVID-19 and not about immigration. It was, When is your Ambassador going to get here?

Fortunately, since then, the Senate has approved the nomination of Ken Salazar to be Ambassador to Mexico, but the exchange underscores the importance of having U.S. Ambassadors on the ground and the value that other nations see in Senate-confirmed representatives of the United States.

I take the floor today to talk about three noncontroversial nominees: Adam Scheinman, of Virginia, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation; Marc Ostfield to be Ambassador to Paraguay; and Cynthia Telles to be Ambassador to Costa Rica.

Mr. Scheinman has had a long history in the State Department and on the National Security Council at the White House on Nuclear Nonproliferation issues.

Marc Ostfield is a career Foreign Service Officer with deep experience in the Americas.

Cynthia Telles is the daughter of the first Hispanic to be a U.S. Ambassador. Her father was the U.S. Ambassador to Costa Rica 60 years ago, and after a very distinguished career, she has been nominated to inherit the post that he ably inhabited.

These were all nominees approved noncontroversially by the Foreign Relations Committee on October 19, nearly 2 months ago.

I will just mention to my colleagues one thing about Mr. Scheinman. It is particularly important that he be confirmed as soon as possible. An important duty of the Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation is to lead the U.S. delegation to the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty Review Conference. This conference happens once every 5 years—once every 5 years—and it is going to happen next month. If he is not confirmed before then, the United States will not have an Ambassador-level official to lead the American delegation at this existentially important meeting.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 433, 436, and 439; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order on these nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The eyes of history are on the Senate today. If the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline comes online, as it is on the verge of doing, the odds of Russian tanks rolling into Ukraine increase dramatically. We have imposed sanctions on the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline with bipartisan unity. We can do it again.

If Russian tanks roll into Kiev, who in this Chamber wants that on their conscience?

We need to stop Russia from invading Ukraine, and the only way to do it is by imposing sanctions on Nord Stream 2. We did that 2 years ago. We overwhelmingly passed bipartisan sanctions that President Trump signed into law.

It is worth explaining why these two are linked.

We are all reading in the newspaper—and my friend from Virginia and I have sat in briefings, classified and public briefings—that over 100,000 Russian troops are massed on the Ukraine border. The administration declassified its own projections that an invasion of Ukraine is imminent and could come as soon as January or February of next year. This disaster is the direct result of a political mistake made by Joe Biden.

What does the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline have to do with Russia's invading Ukraine?

Well, here is a little bit of ancient history. In the year 2014, Vladimir Putin invaded Ukraine.

Why?

He did it because he has said that he considers the dissolution of the Soviet Union to be the greatest geopolitical disaster of the 21st century, and his grand ambition is to recreate the Soviet Union—by force.

A reassembled Soviet Union would be a profound threat to the safety of all Americans. We spent decades with a dangerous Soviet Union. In 2014, Putin invaded Ukraine—he invaded Crimea—but he stopped. He didn't go through all of Ukraine.

Why did he stop?

He stopped because Russian natural gas, to get to Europe, goes through Ukraine. The pipelines go through Ukraine.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, may I invoke regular order? This is not a response to any of these three nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the request?

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

There is nothing in regular order that limits my ability to explain my view on this topic.

So, apparently, the Democrats don't want to talk about Joe Biden's gift to Russia and Putin that has set up the tanks on the border of Ukraine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. CRUZ. Is the Chair refusing to let me speak?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has a scheduled vote. You see that Members have made their way to the floor. We have a lot of business to take care of, as you see.

Mr. CRUZ. And, just a moment ago, the Chair granted unanimous consent that that time be extended until this unanimous consent request was concluded. That is the pending UC that was granted.

If Senator KAINE or the Chair wants to silence me because you don't want to hear what is happening in Ukraine, you can try to do that.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, we have no interest in silencing Senator CRUZ. In fact, the Democrats agreed to allow Senator CRUZ to present his amendment on Nord Stream 2 last week, and it was blocked by Republican colleagues.

I have made a request for unanimous consent about two Ambassadors to the Americas and about someone who needs to attend a nuclear nonproliferation conference and lead the delegation from the United States. It happens once every 5 years, and it is coming up.

The Senator is allowed to speak about Nord Stream 2 for as long as he wants, but he shouldn't interrupt a UC for these three individuals to give a speech that he has given many times and that he is going to continue to give many times, and I am sure we are all going to hear it many times.

I would like a ruling on my request for unanimous consent on these three nominees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I object. And the Chair and the Democrats are hiding from the truth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON ROLLINS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rollins nomination?

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 486 Ex.]

#### YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kelly	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

#### NAYS—50

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

(Ms. STABENOW assumed the Chair.)

(Ms. ROSEN assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the nomination is confirmed.

The nomination was confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will immediately be notified of the Senate's actions.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 482, Michael D. Smith, of Virginia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

Charles E. Schumer, Tammy Baldwin, Angus S. King, Jr., Patrick J. Leahy, John W. Hickenlooper, Jon Ossoff, Richard J. Durbin, Jeff Merkley, Benjamin L. Cardin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Mark Kelly, Kyrsten Sinema, Joe Manchin III, Edward J. Markey, Richard Blumenthal, Jack Reed, Raphael G. Warnock, Jeanne Shaheen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.